

portion of Greek mythology and allegory will apply to our general purposes; and, as far as they are so applicable, they are unimprovable. There is something so exquisite in the conceptions of these ideal and figurative beings, which so beautifully personify the different qualities, physical or moral, that they represent,—their roots are so deep in nature,—that they must ever have a potent spell upon our feelings and imagination. For emblematic illustration, what could be superior to the attributes and emblems of the mythology? The helmet and lance were the symbols of war, and may be such while war continues. The lyre and laurel branch are still appropriate symbols of harmony and fame. The myrtle-branch and the dove were to characterise affection, and may still do so, as the palm branch and wreath may announce victory, and the olive, peace. Though symbols of a vanished creed, do they not belong to humanity? No more natural and beautiful emblem of justice than the equal balance could be conceived: the hoodwink of impartiality, the veil of Modesty, the bridle of Temperance, are unrivalled in their significant beauty. Festoons, wreaths, garlands, to whatsoever they owe their origin, have been universally received among cultivated nations as representative of certain ideas, and may still be so employed while art shall need them. Symbolism and allegory are a source that has been inadequately drawn upon in modern architecture: yet it is surely an artistic one. The Greek architecture spoke by it, and emblems were invented when ancient art had reached a high point of perfection. The trope and metaphor of poetry and Scripture are used on the same principle,—to illustrate and strengthen the intended idea. What striking morals are conveyed by allegorical persons and things in poetry! The destination of some buildings cannot be distinguished from that of others by an appeal to analogy alone, and therefore a further language is required; and here is one of almost infinite scope, that supplies genius with a boundless field of invention,—a rich and beautiful language, and, withal, a natural one, for we are instinctively prone to allegorise: personification is the natural language of feeling and imagination.

But whatever mode of illustration we adopt, we must not neglect our own national resources. In drawing from British literature and history, and embodying in stone the creations of our poetry, or the great historical personages of our country, we follow the highest ancient examples, and such subjects generally will be more interesting to English hearts than the brightest imaginings of Homer and Hesiod. Thus enriched, we should find no difficulty in characterizing our respective works. The destinations of modern edifices are not too numerous in their variety to be distinguished, when all our resources are drawn upon, and all our unwrought elements organized. The various arts and sciences,—the different virtues, have their respective natural emblems; the Romans deified all the virtues, and gave them their appropriate attributes, or distinguished them by their attire, and such creations we could not improve. The instruments used in the various arts and sciences have been employed on buildings as indications of their devotion to these arts, and they may be still employed with the greatest propriety. We do well to immortalise in stone the falling forms of nature; but artificial forms are often called for, and may not only be useful in expression, but conducive to beauty: many musical and other art instruments are graceful in form, and, while so, they are, though the work of man, also reflections of the work of God.

The representing literally the use of a building by means of sculpture or painting, with a view to rendering the work completely phonetic, good taste, I think, would not sanction: the phonetic quality is not called for or desirable in architecture,—nor are painting and sculpture higher arts than architecture, from being phonetic: if they were, the lowest branch of literature might claim precedence of it. The subject of Paul preaching at Athens, on the facade, or in the pediment of a building, would speak plainly enough of Christian worship; but this mode of expression would be more

prosaic than poetical, and would remind us too much of the significant hat or boot of colossal dimensions, that project into some of our trading streets.

I observed above that one style is better fitted for expressing a given character than another. Now, this peculiar and exclusive fitness for one purpose, eminently characterizes the Gothic or pointed style of architecture, which deserves separate notice here. The Gothic system is not what many of the advocates of the classic styles have asserted it to be,—an incoherent style, unnatural and false in principle, devoid of all harmony and proportions. Nor is it full of inconsistencies and caprices, as contended by others. Inconsistencies and caprices appear only at first sight, and to superficial or prejudiced observers. The great monuments of this style evince the most striking intention of purpose, and a power of expressive grandeur and sublimity in harmony with that purpose, which no other system could have secured. But Gothic architecture, notwithstanding, will never become the universal style. It is only adapted to the expression of qualities analogous to sacred uses, and will be the more sacred in its associations from being exclusively devoted to such uses. The cathedrals and churches erected during the Gothic period were exactly adapted to the Roman Catholic ritual—the form of devotion then in use, to processions and every other ceremony connected with the religious service of the day. Music, for example, was an important part of the service, and the cathedrals were built so as to give the finest effect to music: they were covered interiorly with sculptural and pictorial decoration in harmony with the spirit, and symbolizing the leading points of belief; and like the mase of material beauty in nature speaking also of the eternal splendour and sublimity. There was a completeness of adaptation, a conspiracy for the expression of one idea, perhaps never before or since exhibited. "Then," says Menzel, in his History of Germany, "the pile resounded and spoke, like God from the clouds, from its lofty tower, or alternately sorrowed and rejoiced, like man, in the deep swelling organ: the arts of the founder and musician were each devoted to the service of the Church." The Tudor style is suited to all buildings of a domestic character, but ecclesiastical Gothic, applied to civil or domestic purposes, is out of its natural element, and must present to the eye of taste inconsistency of the grossest kind. It can have no harmony or sympathy with ideas and enterprizes of earth, which it seems to spurn. It speaks not home to men's "every-day business and bosoms." It is all-aspiring, like the flame, heavenward; and finds a solution of its mystery only in the faith that points to worlds

"Far above the clouds and beyond the tomb."

In respect of mere sensuous beauty, it (Gothic architecture) cannot compare with the Greek, which possesses the most exquisite adaptation of form and style to every variety of purpose; but I have spoken of it as regards its vitality and power and truthfulness to its original and peculiar purpose: as regards its application to ecclesiastical uses and power of analogous and symbolical expression, Gothic architecture is a perfect system; it fills a high and holy place in art, to which it is wonderfully, we might almost say divinely, adapted; and I would have it respected like a thing set apart, and which nothing secular should profane.

It must, however, be observed that for general purposes of expression, an architect need not fetter his genius to the particular mode or style of any age or country past or present. Indeed so fettered he cannot give suitable expression: his self-imposed manacles will be among the causes of his failure. On observance of distinct style beauty is not dependant, and an expressive character may be given without it: nay, architecture itself may be conceived of as distinct from style: style is the servant—an useful one—of architecture, but not its master. A building, I apprehend, might be so designed and erected as to exhibit no trace of any style known in the world, and yet be good architecture,—a real work of art. The circumstances of climate and situation under which

an edifice is to be built, and its destined use, may be so peculiar as to dictate a form of structure and style of decoration differing from anything existing; yet an unblinded attention to such dictation might result in an artistic and meritorious production. It belongs to the very idea of a fine art as distinguished from the mechanical arts, to yield the utmost scope to the inventive faculties throughout; and the remark applies to architecture as far as consistent with the prior demands of utility,—the first law. The critic should therefore be taught to judge of architecture independently of style, and in reference only to philosophical, i. e., abstract architectural principle. We should not consider whether two or more features we would wish to introduce into a design belong to one style, and were employed together in ancient examples; but whether they would naturally harmonize. With all due reverence for Italian architecture, I hesitate not to say, that as a style or system of architectural design, we have nothing to do with it. With its members, its mouldings, as with words, we have to do. We have to resolve it into its original elements, taking due advantage of what Italy or modern design has contributed to the general stock as additional words enriching and swelling the antique languages, for the expression of English ideas. Using it otherwise, might remind one of a tradesman or shopkeeper going to his brother trader instead of the merchant for his goods. We might as well take the French architecture, or the Spanish modification of the classic: the error, different indeed in degree would be the same in kind. Why use a translation when we can read the original? Or go to a derived system when we can have access to the parent source?

But whatever the style, or whether we have style or not, the present purposes of our buildings, be those purposes what they may, must govern the form or plan, which should be precisely what the purpose requires,—adapted to situations and circumstances without reference to the associations of past art, or the requirements of deceased institutions. The signs of language or elements we use, must be employed not in repeating ancient thoughts, and feelings, and purposes, but in clothing the ideas of to-day with a material form. The purpose or destination is to a building what the subject or fable is to a poem, and like the subject in the poem, this purpose should thrill, as it were, through every part, and beam from every feature. The idea of its design must be conceived in accordance with our English habits and manner of life, customs, worship, &c., according as it is public or private, and that idea of its use or destination must pass like a spirit into the building, and pervade and animate it. Art owns nature and reason, not precedent, for her law-giver: "it is not metre, but a metre-making argument, that makes the poem." Nor is it columns and entablatures, nor arcades and buttresses, that constitute architecture. "For works which are the result of the mere connexion of even beautiful forms," observes a German writer on Art, "would themselves be without all beauty, as that which gives beauty to the whole cannot be form. It is beyond form—it is the essential, the universal, the aspect, and expression of the indwelling spirit of nature."\*

S. H.

**VIEW OF THE EXHIBITION BUILDING.**—A capital view of the transept of the Exhibition Palace, showing the interior, looking north, has been drawn and engraved by Mr. John Sadler.†

**KENSINGTON TURNPIKE TOLLS.**—A strong feeling of injustice has induced the inhabitants of Kensington to organize an energetic agitation against the numerous turnpike-gates existing within the limits of their parish, mulcting the passers through them, it is said, to the extent of 20,000*l.* a year, while the just proportion due for keeping the metropolitan roads in repair is estimated at less than 2,000*l.* One consequence is said to be that out of every ten houses in the parish one is unoccupied.

\* To be continued.

† London: C. and E. Layton.